

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

PENDLETON DIVISION

FRANK E. VOTH,

Plaintiff,

v.

**MARK NOOTH; WILLIAM KING;
DANIEL BANNER; COLETTE
PETERS; GREGORY JONES; and
MARICELA ROJAS,**

Defendant.

No. 2:14-cv-01855-AC

OPINION AND ORDER

MOSMAN, J.,

On May 3, 2016, Magistrate Judge John Acosta issued his Findings and Recommendation (F&R) [81], recommending that Plaintiff Frank Voth's Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order [68] and Supplement to the Motion [72] be construed as a motion for preliminary injunction and be DENIED. No objections to the Findings and Recommendation were filed.

DISCUSSION


The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge, but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to make a *de novo* determination regarding those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the court is not required to review, *de novo* or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of

the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F&R depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any part of the F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Upon review, I agree with Judge Acosta's recommendation and I ADOPT the F&R [81] as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 1 day of June, 2016.



MICHAEL W. MOSMAN
Chief United States District Judge